

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-23. Claims 8-10, 12-15 and 19-23 are allowed, claims 5 and 17 are objected to, and claims 1-3, 5-7 and 16-18 are rejected. With this paper, none of the claims are canceled and no new claims are added, so that claims 1-3, 5-10, and 12-23 remain in the application.

Rejections under 35 USC §103

At sections 1-2 of the Office action, claims 1-3, 5-7, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over W099/30479 (hereinafter Alperrovich) in view of U.S. Pat. App. Pub. No. 2004/0092265 (hereinafter Chitrapu) and US Pat. App. Pub. No. 2003/0026399 (hereinafter Carlson). Of the claims so rejected, the sole independent claim is claim 1.

As to claim 1: Claim 1 is to a method for use by a communication device in: obtaining information about one or more currently active cellular network systems to each of which the device has one or more active connections for respective connected applications hosted by the device, wherein the information includes at least the number and type of connections currently in use; and deciding whether to allow establishing a new connection to one of the currently active cellular network systems or to another cellular network system on behalf of another application hosted by the device based on factors including the information about currently active cellular network systems.

The Office relies on Alperrovich, page 3, lines 19-22 and page 4, line 23 through page 5, line 4 for teaching a device obtaining information about one currently active cellular network system to which the device has an active connection and deciding whether to allow establishing a new connection with another network system to which the device is not connected. At the

cited passages, however, Alperrovich discloses a mobile station subscribed to one PLMN, which changes to a different PLMN due to roaming out of the area of the subscribed PLMN; selection of the new PLMN is by virtue of the mobile station receiving messages from a broadcast channel, which provides information about the available PLMNs.

Alperrovich does not disclose or suggest that the communication device has an active connection to each of the currently active cellular network systems, as required by claim 1 of the current invention. Alperrovich also fails to take into account "factors including the information about *currently active* cellular network systems," as claimed, as the information on the BCCH can be received while the mobile terminal is in idle mode and thus not having an active connection to the network. Further, Alperrovich discloses that the BCCH information provided to the communication device includes network *identity* information, whereas claim 1 of the current invention requires that the information include at least *the number and the type* of the active cellular network systems available for connection, not merely identity.

The Office relies on Chitrapu for disclosing combinations allowed by each currently active network system (Fig. 2, para. [0014], lines 1-12 and paras. [0016]-[0017]). In contrast to claim 1 of the current invention, however, Chitrapu discloses the available networks to which the mobile station may switch connections, but does not disclose or suggest the features that are lacking in Alperrovich, as discussed above. Specifically, the recited steps as claimed require that the communication device have one or more *active* connections to each of the one or more currently active cellular network systems. Chitrapu fails to disclose or suggest this feature.

The Office relies on Carlson for disclosing determining the number of carriers, i.e. at least the number of connections for selection of the system. Further in contrast to the claimed invention, however, Carlson discloses the selection of a carrier for an ADSL system, and does not disclose or suggest communication via a cellular network system, as required by claim 1. Moreover, Carlson does not disclose or suggest the features that are lacking in Alperrovich, as discussed above.

Consequently, Alperrovich, Chitrapu and Carlson, taken singly or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all the features of the invention as recited in claim 1. For at least the reasons provided above with regard to claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC §103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 2-3, 5-7 and 16-18 are directly or indirectly dependent from claim 1 and recite additional features not recited in claim 1. For at least the reasons provided above with regard to claim 1, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 2-3, 5-7 and 16-18 under 35 USC §103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

At section 3 of the Office action, the Office objects to claims 5 and 17 as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but asserts that claims 5 and 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claims and intervening claims. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5 and 17 are allowable in view of the above reasoning and at least in view of their dependencies.

CONCLUSION


For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

5.1.08

Date

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS  
& ADOLPHSON LLP  
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224  
Monroe, CT 06468-0224



Cathy A. Sturmer  
Registration No. 60,869

tel: (203) 261-1234  
Cust. No.: 004955